

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated January 11, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-19 remain present in the application, with claims 1, 10 and 19 being the only independent claims. Claim 19 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, in particular “because claim of a computer program is not patentable” (Office Action, paragraph 1). Applicant has amended claim 19 to recite a computer readable storage medium. With the amendment to claim 19, Applicant believes that the reason for the examiner's rejection under 35 USC 101 has been obviated.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Borden., IV et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,857,128 (Hereinafter “Borden”). Claims 2, 9, 11 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borden.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the examiner's reasons for rejecting the claims.

Claim 1 recites:



1. A method of displaying information in cells of a grid electronic program guide, the method comprising the steps of:

storing a banner with the information for each cell of the grid electronic program guide;

selecting at least one cell; and

rotating the banner in each cell in the at least one selected cell to display the banner a predetermined number of times.

Claim 1 thus recites that a banner is stored with information for each cell of the EPG and that to display the banner, it is rotated in a selected cell a predetermined number of times. As is well-known in the art and as described in the “Background of the Invention” section of the present invention, an EPG contains a matrix of fixed cell sizes: “FIG. 1 illustrates a typical grid EPG 100 which includes a schedule information area 102 having a program matrix 104 of cells or items that depict the shows that are being presented on each channel at each time of the day” [0002]. This fixed-size nature of the individual cells creates a problem in the prior art – the individual program data (the title of the program) has to be presented in a very condensed form. Thus, in a typical grid EPG, the titles of the programs will have to be presented in a truncated form as is illustrated in FIG. 1” [0004].

The present invention provides a remedy for this problem. In particular and as claimed in claim 1 and illustrated in Figs. 5A-5I, the present invention deals with the fixed cell size problem by rotating banner information within the selected cell. Further, it does so a predetermined number of times.



Borden et al. relates generally to an EPG browsing system and method. In particular, Borden addresses the problem in the EPG prior art of displaying additional data which corresponds to a program cell entry. Typically, an additional window is opened which displays this additional data (e.g., item 38 in Fig. 2). Borden deals with the prior art problem of the varying location of this window. In particular, and as stated in Borden's specification:

The disclosed embodiments of the present invention can improve viewer interaction and the display of information for an EPG display. Instead of a roving cursor and a two-position program note overlay, a preferred embodiment of the present invention uses a stationary selection area and a selectable but **stationary program note display area** [emphasis added]. The viewer in essence "scrolls" the EPG display to manipulate programs into the selection area. Each scroll can be accompanied by a visual scrolling cue or animation. Because the location of the selection area is constant and in a constant relationship (preferably adjacent) to the program note display area, the viewer need not search for these areas after every control manipulation ... (col. 2, line 59 – col. 3, line 6)

As used by Borden, the selection area (e.g. item 62 in Fig. 3) is the means by which a desired program is selected. As note above, "scrolling" relates to positioning a desired program in that selection area (also see col. 3, lines 8-15). Moreover, and as depicted in Fig. 5, once a program is selected, the information is displayed in a program note display area (an expanded area (item 92)) and not in the originally selected cell, as claimed by the present invention.

The Office Action points to Fig. 5 as teaching various claim features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, the information displayed by Borden does not appear in the original selected cell – thus not only failing to teach the "rotating the banner in each [selected] cell" feature of claim 1, but in fact teaching away from it.



Further, the “scrolling” described in col. 5, lines 19-25 and cited by the examiner relates to navigating to select a cell – and thus fails to teach the “rotating the banner” feature as asserted by the examiner. Still further, the “scroll[ing] at a predetermined rate,” described in col. 6, lines 30-32 and cited by the examiner, does not relate to “rotating the banner” in general, much less address the claimed feature where this is performed a “predetermined number of times.”

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Borden cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Borden fails to disclose each and every element recited. As shown, Borden fails to disclose the limitations of rotating a banner in a selected cell a predetermined number of times as claimed. Independent claims 10 and 19 also contain these features and are deemed patentable over Borden for at least the same reasons.

Having shown that Borden fails to disclose each and every element claimed, applicant submits that claims 1, 10 and 19 are allowable over Borden. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 10 and 19.

With regard to claims 2-9 and 11-18, these claims ultimately depend from either claim 1 or claim 10, which have been shown to be not anticipated and allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, each of claims 2-9 and 11-18 is also allowable by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim.



For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,079



By: Thomas Onka  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,053

Date: April 6, 2008

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**Certificate of Mailing/Transmission Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313-1450 or transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No (571) 273-8300 on \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature and Date)